The Rothbard-Rockwell Report
TRIPLE R

A Death Blow to Feminism

Michael Levin

Occasionally the very publication of a book, its critical reception, and the attendant fuss signal an event of larger cultural significance. *The Bell Curve* was the last such phenomenon, and now we have our next one: *The Rules*, by Ellen Fein and Sherrie Schneider.

In case you haven't heard of it (or read it over lunch; it is that short), *The Rules* is a manual addressed to women on how to make a man propose. And not just propose, but find her "a creature like no other" who will remain devoted always. Nor is it a one-sided Baedecker for women wishing to acquire an eager slave; its instructions are meant to insure long-run happiness for both husband and wife.

As self-help books go *The Rules* is a good one, with a depth of psychological insight belied by its breezy, advice-column style. However, what has made it a literary event, a mini-milestone, is its implicit yet thorough repudiation of feminism. It says the feminists were wrong about everything concerning men and women–and this means everything–while grandma was right. And this revanchist work is selling like hot cakes.

The catchy format of *The Rules* is a list of 35 highly specific do's and don'ts about female behavior in a variety of dating and mating situations. For instance. Rule #12 tells "the *Rules* girl" to "Stop Dating Him if He Doesn't Buy You a Romantic Gift for Your Birthday or Valentine's Day." This sounds manipulative, but the quite sound idea here is that if a man loves a woman, he thinks with "his heart, not his head."

The basic message of the book, though, is that women must play hard to get, or, as they used to say before feminists censorship made all truthful jesting about romance taboo, "the man chases the woman until she catches him." Let him telephone you, don't talk too long on the telephone, end the conversation first, never accept a date for Saturday after Wednesday, don't tell a man your secret thoughts until you've known him a while, never initiate an approach to a man. Thus *The Rules*: Always leave 'em hungry for more.

The authors base this advice on frank recognition of what critics of feminism have been urging for decades: there are biological differences between the sexes that extend to the psyche. "We trust in the natural order of things," Fein and Schneider write, "namely that man pursues woman." The man must take the lead. If you refuse to accept that men and women are different romantically, you will behave like men and drive them away." They are emphatic about the importance of this asymmetry for sex (of which more anon): "Biologically, the man must pursue the woman. If you bring up sex all the time, you will emasculate him." Instead, the *Rules* girl flirts; "this will turn him into a tiger."

Fein and Schneider often allude to what is "meant to happen," advising that if nothing happens between a man and a *Rules*-following woman, "it wasn't supposed to happen." They are not talking about Kismet, but the biological script for successful mating. Love occurs a certain way between the sexes (he pursues her until...), so if it doesn't happen that way, if she cannot induce him to pursue her, it is not going to happen at all. Really, this is just what women instinctively knew until feminists talked them out of it.

continued on page 5

INSIDE

Intelligence Briefing.....2

Where the Right Goes Wrong.....7
HANS-HERMANN HOPPE

Hoppe and the *Freeman*.....14
PAUL GOTTFRIED

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

INTELLIGENCE BRIEFING

✦ **Inside the Pornway:** John Stagliano, owner of "Evil Angel Video," is "the nation's leading director of hard-core videos." Stagliano also "performs" in his pornographic films and is "a major contributor to the Cato Institute, a well-known think tank in Washington, D.C., where he regularly discusses policy issues with its economists" (*U.S. News and World Report*, Feb. 10, 1997).

✦ **Did Stagliano dream up Cato's Social Security "privatization"?** It requires a 20 percent tax increase and $7.5 trillion in new government borrowing. Or maybe it was his idea to spend $30 billion per annum on federal private-school subsidies for the "poor." Query: Does anyone know how the porn industry fared under the Cato-promoted Nafta and Gatt?

✦ **Will central banks dump gold?** In Adrian Day's view (*Investment Analyst*, Feb. 1997), central banks are terrified of a world without any gold as a backup. Could confidence be maintained? The "stage is set for a powerful up move" in gold "when the negative factors," real or imagined, "run out of steam." His best gold-stock buys: Newmont and Euro Nevada. His top-quality juniors: Eldorado, Miramar, Bema Gold, Trillion, and Pangea Goldfields. He is selling all global mutual funds.

✦ **James Grant sees any gold-selling by central banks as bullish** (*Grant's*, Jan. 17, 1997). He theorizes that when dollar demand is as sky-high as it is today, it has no where to go but down, and investors will have no where to go but commodities when the Fed overreacts. "We happen now to be very bullish on gold, first and foremost because the situation is so evidently hopeless." So tight are credit spreads, so devout is faith in central bankers, and so low are interest rates that "something could upset the equilibrium." The "gold market is priced for the ideal outcome."

✦ **Lord Rees-Mogg predicts a stock-market crash**, probably this autumn (*Strategic Investment*, Jan. 21, 1997). "I expect the fall in the panic stage, if that occurs, to be not less than 20%, and perhaps as high as 40%, or between 1,300 and 2,600 off the Dow-Jones."

✦ **Ron Paul was blackballed by a foreign government.** He had been assured of appointment to the foreign affairs committee by the Republican leadership, since it is not considered a plum assignment (too few opportunities for legal graft). But within an hour of his faxing his official request to Newt, foreign lobbyists were swarming the Capitol's corridors to block him. It seems they were threatened by a man who stands for the foreign-policy principles of the framers, and is therefore anti-foreign aid, anti-foreign meddling, and anti-foreign war.

✦ **Were blacks involved in the slave trade?** Of course, but Americans will be protected from that unpalatable truth. Britain's Sir Peter Hall is making a tv program on the African slave trade, and an American network had promised to help finance it. There was only one condition: "none of the slave traders was to be black" (*Spectator*, Jan. 11, 1997). But, said Hall, "black slave barons sold other blacks to the white merchants." He told the American televison executive that the black slave trader must remain black. The U.S. executive said, no dollars then."

✦ **Do we have to read the *National Enquirer* to find out the truth?** The national media may prate about "journalistic ethics," which are in the same laugh-category as "Congressional ethics," but the *Enquirer* actually informs us. For example, the Feb. 11, 1997, issue tells us that LA police think Ennis Cosby was gunned down by a drug dealer. If that's true, it was no random killing "by a white man," in one of the few racial identifications of a criminal you've ever heard. The police are also calling his white girlfriend, who may have witnessed the murder, "unreliable," meaning they think she's lying.

✦ **Death and taxes:** last year, Russian tax protesters killed 26 agents, wounded 74, kidnapped six, and burned down the houses of 41, according to the Itar-Tass news agency (Jan. 27, 1997). Also, they blew up 18 tax offices with bombs.

✦ **"Clinton had an affair with my wife,"** says former Clinton partner

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in crime Jim McDougal. That's why Susan McDougal refuses to talk about her crooked business dealings with the prez (London *Times*, Feb. 11, 1997).

✦ **A peek into the heart of power**: among the materials Newt turned over to the ethics committee were large drawings he made as speech illustrations. In them, he portrayed himself as a glowing sun god, surrounded by staff, Congress, special interest groups, the media, and–furthest out–the people. In one handwritten statement of his "primary mission," Gingrich refers to himself as the "definer" of "civilization," the "arouser of those who form civilization," and the "teacher of the rules of civilization" (*Washington Post*, Jan. 22, 1997).

✦ **Ron Paul is "so strict" in opposing redistribution**, reports *Roll Call*, that he refused to "allow his five children to accept federal student loans for college or medical school," and he wouldn't "accept Medicare or Medicaid payments" in his medical practice.

✦ **Did the CIA ship drugs into Miami?** Sure, says the U.S. attorney in that city, who is prosecuting the former head of a CIA-funded "anti-drug" agency in Venezuela. General Ramon Guillen is charged with smuggling 22 tons of cocaine into the U.S. from 1981-1991. U.S. officials say that "one–maybe two–of these shipments, totaling more than a ton, were approved by the CIA as part of a 'sting' operation," but not the rest (London *Times*, Jan. 16, 1997).

✦ **Shameless is one word that comes to mind when describing Jack Kemp.** This self-aggrandizing, welfare-promoting, illegal-immigrant-loving, self-righteous political failure is now testing the waters for 2000. He's enlisted liberal consultant John Sears, and is putting together a PAC to loot anybody stupid enough to give him any money. True conservatives are appalled by the prospect of President Kemp. But if neocons need any shoring up against him, let them never forget–and never forgive–his praise of Louis Farrakhan.

✦ **Will Clinton start a war?** "It's hard," he told the *New York Times* (Feb. 11, 1997), "when you're not threatened by a foreign enemy to whip people up to a fever pitch of common, intense, sustained, disciplined endeavor." And there we have the great ambition of the modern presidency in a nutshell. Keep people hysterical. Make them cling to you out of fear.

✦ **On the other hand**, who's got the better plan for education, Bill Clinton or the supposed libertarian writer Charles Murray? Clinton wants to spend $51 billion over the next five years. Murray wants to spend $150 billion (*$150 billion!*) this year and every year after, and such other sums as may be necessary, to nationalize the private-school industry in the service of the central state and its clients. See pages pp. 37, 90, 97, etc. of *What It Means To Be a Libertarian: A Personal Interpretation.*

✦ **What's the evidence for the idea that the framers wanted a "citizen legislature"?** There is nothing wrong, and everything right, with some men specializing in statesmanship, as Charley Reese has pointed out in another context (on why certain third parties won't ever go anywhere). The framers were statesmen for liberty. They didn't live off the taxpayers, of course, but men like Thomas Jefferson, Patrick Henry, and George Mason were no amateurs.

✦ **The voucher movement is becoming even more openly pro-welfare.** According to black nationalist leader Polly Williams, the grand dame of educational welfare, "This program is about black parents and other low-income parents having the right to choose the kind of education they want for their children and not being penalized for having no money."

✦ **Janet Reno and the Justice Department have sworn to destroy the states rights movement.** Congratulations to the Individual Rights Foundation in Los Angeles, which is suing the feds over this conspiracy to violate the right of citizens to organize politically. The foundation has unearthed the notes of a meeting between a U.S. attorney and officials from the so-called Justice Department in which they vowed to "stop the states' rights movement." This, say the notes, "has been made a priority issue for the U.S. Attorney's Office as well as the Department of Justice" (*Washington Times*, Oct. 17, 1997).

✦ **Nothing is more maddening** for a customer than having to put up with employees speaking a foreign language in your presence. It's quite possibly the rudest act imaginable outside of threatening physical violence. But now, it turns out, the courts and the federal government have made it impossible to fire someone for this, much less to impose English-only rules. This would create a "hostile environment," which violates civil rights laws (*WSJ*, Jan. 23, 1997).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

✦ **Americans have an "obsession" with conspiracy theories, according to the *New York Times*** (Dec. 31, 1996). "Many people, for example, bought former ABC correspondent Pierre Salinger's claim that a Navy missile blew up TWA Flight 800." Other crazy views from average Americans: that Vince Foster was murdered, that a world government is coming, and that the CIA sells drugs. Of course, the *Times* notes, "in the Soviet bloc, you had to be crazy *not* to be paranoid about a Government whose officials published election results in advance and lied about the weather." We know *our* government would never, for example, dream up scary weather stories like global warming to accumulate more money and power.

✦ **The civil rights reign of terror** has been stepped up, with the number of federal class-action lawsuits doubling in the last four years. The reason: George Bush's 1991 amendment to the Civil Rights Act, which increases the payoff and makes discrimination easier to prove. Not a quota bill, right George? After the outrageous Texaco fiasco, pending class action cases still include Home Depot, Publix Super Markets, Glorious Foods, Motel 6, Dun & Bradstreet, and Smith Barney. The chief legal culprit is the Oakland law firm of Saperstein, Goldstein, Demchak & Baller–the killer-firm that brought down Shoney's and Denny's.

✦ **The last page of the *Weekly Standard* features a political parody** of some sort, sometimes funny, sometimes not. This time (Feb. 17, 1997) the ad next to the parody was the funniest of all. "Give the Children Hope," read the headline above photographs of black and Hispanic kids. The "Christian Coalition's Samaritan Project is a bold and compassionate plan to combat poverty and restore hope." And how? Among other big ideas, "We call for vigorous enforcement of existing civil rights laws." Well, that should make the liberals love the Christian Coalition. *Not.*

✦ **Get ready for Ralph Reed's further lurch to the left** with the Congress on Racial Justice and Reconciliation, a much-hyped meeting on May 3 in Baltimore, modeled on the Promise Keepers cult. Reed will demand that the federal government step up welfare spending to rescue "at-risk" youth and federal education vouchers for the poor to attend the private school you scrimp and save to send your children to in order to avoid excessive exposure to "at-risk" youth. "For too long," says Reed, "our movement" has been primarily "white," with its "center of gravity in the cloistered safety of the suburbs" (*Washington Times*, Jan. 31, 1997). Right: and Ralph should lead the way by moving to Harlem.

✦ **The feds will lose the Oklahoma bombing case,** they are strongly hinting via the big media (*NYT*, Jan. 31, 1997). If you know something about the way the FBI infiltrates political movements, you've long suspected that the government's fingerprints were somewhere on this operation. But that's not why it will lose the case. The big excuse is that the FBI handled the evidence poorly. The man who supervised evidence collection is known to have changed dictated evidence reports to make them seem to support the government's and the prosecutor's version of events. In short, Timothy McVeigh will be let off on a technicality so that the government can avoid a deeper investigation into its infiltration practices and its habit of goading dissenters into breaking the law.

✦ **You have to read English papers to find out the truth on the Oklahoma case.** "The only conclusion one can draw," says Ambrose Evans-Pritchard in the *Sunday Telegraph* (Feb. 2, 1997), "is that the Justice Department is protecting a federal informant who had penetrated the bombing conspiracy–probably [Andreas] Strassmeir, but possibly also [Michael] Brescia–and is trying to cover up a bungled sting. McVeigh's defense lawyer, Stephen Jones, says that the American people will never be able to think of their government in the same way once they learn the full truth about the Oklahoma bombing."

✦ **One of the many crimes of the Republican Party** in the 104th Congress was to authorize a pilot program in which the IRS contracts out to private law firms to do its dirty work. The echoes are of 18th-century-style tax farming, the catalyst for the French revolution. But it gets worse. Faced with ever-falling audit rates and constantly failing computers, the IRS has floated the idea of contracting out the entire paper-return processing system. The new Congress likes the idea because it is sure to bring in more revenue. The major resistance comes from the IRS employees themselves, who fear they will be displaced. Who would have thought it: IRS civil servants and the *Triple R* on the same side of an issue.

✦ **We're "Fighting Back!" against abuse,** says the solicitation from *Free Inquiry*, the hate-filled quarterly of the Council for Secular Humanism. They offer a new report to "turn the tide for free-thinking individuals who

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are tired of the abuses and indignities hurled at them." And what are these abuses? People who say "'God Bless You,' When You Sneeze" or ask you, "Did You Have a Merry Christmas?" Also: "Invitations to Weddings and Other Functions That Include Religious Ceremonies"; "The Dinner Host Who Suggests Saying Grace"; and, inevitably, when "You or a Loved One Are Physically Blocked from Entering an Abortion Clinic."

✦ **Ron Paul has the right ideas, and the right photos** (*Insight*, Feb. 10, 1997): "A visit to his office makes it clear that Paul does not plan to be a quiet congressman. On his wall are framed pictures of libertarian economic theorists Ludwig von Mises, Murray Rothbard, and Henry Hazlitt. His staff's shelves are lined with libertarian classics including Rothbard's *For a New Liberty*."

✦ **Whatever happened to courageous governors who would say no to the federal leviathan?** Good news: Alabama Governor Fob James, Jr., called a press conference after a federal judge–in a typical ACLU-driven usurpation–claimed that the Ten Commandments on an Alabama courthouse wall is illegal according to the first amendment. James said he would call up the National Guard before he would allow the commandments to be censored.

✦ **Check out Ron Paul's Congressional Web-site**: www.house.gov/paul/mainpage.htm. RRR

A DEATH BLOW TO FEMINISM
continued from page 1

On sex *The Rules* is audaciously retrograde. "Forget all the 'free love' theories from the swinging sixties," Fein and Schneider declare. Rule #22 runs "Don't Live with a Man" and #15 runs "Don't Rush Into Sex."

Actually, they are uncharacteristically equivocal about premarital sex, saying "We [*Rules*] girls wait until we're sure," without precisely specifying of what. I suspect they would have liked to turn the clock back even farther–no sex until marriage is decided on–but thought that the zeitgeist can be flouted only up to a point. In any case their reasons for advising marriage-minded women to say no are psychologically sound. "Why risk having him call you easy (and think of you that way) when he's talking to his buddies in the locker room the next day?" Men are happy to have sex with easy women, but they don't fall in love with them.

Remember the feminist complaint that men divide women into whores and Madonnas? Well, men *do* think that way.

Remember the feminist complaint that men divide women into whores and Madonnas? Well, men do think that way, and the path of wisdom recommended by *The Rules* is that women act accordingly (as, in fact, they always have).

This being 1997, one can expect to hear of men who lived happily ever after with women they slept with on the first date, of husbands unconcerned about and accepting of their wives' promiscuous pasts, and similar improving tales of liberation. I am skeptical (as Fein and Schneider are), although as far as I know no social scientist has dared to examine the question. Here is a topic for some doctoral candidate in sociology.

The Rules knows it is scandalizing conventional (i.e., feminist) wisdom. "It's your girlfriends that will probably give you the hardest time," Fein and Schneider write. "Don't be surprised if they take your devotion to *The Rules* as anti-feminist." Their suggestion? "Just smile and change the subject." They might well have counterattacked, asking feminists to put up or shut up, and it is instructive to ask what advice feminists have for marriage-minded women. What sort of book would they have written?

One guesses that the main theme of a feminist *Anti-Rules* would be that women should not want to get married in the first place. Remember "A woman needs a man like a fish needs a bicycle," Gloria Steinem's chief contribution to human wisdom?

A more sane feminist might allow under duress that most women, having internalized their oppression, do want to marry, but she will then angrily ask "What about the exceptions?" At this point we must gently remind her that we are not talking about the exceptions, but rather rules that work for the typical.

We might further caution her that taking the deviant as the norm is the tell-tale mark that gives liberal public policy such an evil name. Construction codes designed around accommodating cripples; school budgets that spend more per capita on the retarded than other students; and, most recently, air pollution standards geared to suffers of respiratory

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

disorders: surely marriage manuals for lesbians are equally grotesque.

Assuming she is still with us, the feminist will insist that, if we must have courtship and marriage, they should be a partnership between equals, with the women just as entitled as the man to seek her interests and demand her rights. The first feminist commandment, after all, is that There Shall Be No Double Standards.[1] This is what *The Rules* say is a big mistake.

Even if a woman is interested in a man, they say, she must have the discipline (the word they use) to let him approach her. "He might be flattered that you [sought him out] and he might even want to have sex with you that night, but he won't be crazy about you." Why? "You made it too easy." Men love a challenge, they say over and over. In fact, by making yourself a supreme challenge to a man, he will value you always because he put too much of his energy into getting you. (Incidentally, although Fein and Schneider seem unaware of it, this agrees with what evolutionary biologists call "parental investment theory.")

The Rules is particularly adamant about women not pressing equality in the bedroom: "Please wait a good amount of time before you begin holding lengthy seminars about your needs during sex or after sex. Don't be a drill sergeant. Being with you in bed should not be difficult or demanding." Many a weary male veteran of the wars of sexual liberation remembers such seminars, always with a wince of pain.

The feminist response to the success of *The Rules* interests me as a professional logician, since I am intrigued by what people say when faced with a definitive refutation of their views. So far as I can tell, feminists have not denied the contention that men, while perfectly happy to have sex with liberated women eager to be their equals, fall in love with elusive women who let them take the initiative. Rather, unconsciously parodying Groucho Marx's line about not wanting to join any club that would have him as a member, feminists are saying that no right-minded woman would want a man they can catch with *The Rules*, or want to be the sort of women who catches him.

The feminist response to the success of *The Rules* interests me as a professional logician.

Cynthia Heimel, whose vulgar nastiness passes for feminist wit, got right to the point in *The Village Voice* (an ultra-p.c. New York weekly that reliably anticipates the platform of the Democratic party). "It is true that this book will instruct you clearly and succinctly in how to get a guy," she writes, "And you will be wildly successful at getting this guy. But it is also true that this guy will be stupid and boring."

She goes on to suggest that women would be better advised to read books on dog training because "Men, and I'm just guessing here, are at least as complicated as dogs." The accompanying illustration shows an unshaven, stupid-looking doofus with a double chin. Incidentally, could any publication express a comparable sentiment about women or blacks without being investigated for harassment by the Justice Department?

Tamara Jenkins, an "independent film maker," goes farther: women who live by the *Rules* are not actually alive. She draws some parallels between *The Rules* and the goings-on in Alfred Hitchcock's old thriller *Vertigo*, comparing the *Rules* girl to the seductive Kim Novak character, who once pretended to fall to her death and ends up actually doing so as paramour Jimmy Stewart looks on. "Sure I have my lonely moments," la Jenkins intones in triumph, "but I'd rather be a live woman's woman than a man's dead woman."

And yet, and yet..."I'm a woman over 30 living in Manhattan and I'm as single as a dollar bill. And now having read the thing, I'm depressed. Uneasy. *The Rules* have gotten under my skin like ringworm.

[1]Except When Gender Quotas Are Needed to Make Up For Eons of Discrimination.

Dean of the Austrian School of economics, founder of modern libertarianism, and restorer of the Old Right, Murray N. Rothbard (1926–1995) was a one-man army of liberty. The *Triple R* is inspired by his spirit, and dedicated to his vision.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

As my biological clock ticks my tough-mindedness softens." The woods–the city streets–are full of Tamara Jenkins, bright, accomplished, independent feminist-women. God help anybody or any institution that shows them insufficient deference. But nature, uninterested in such foibles as "sexual equality," knows only one test of the wisdom of a way of life, and that is successful reproduction. What do the young feminists I knew thirty years ago, now in their fifties and for the most part barren, think of how their lives turned out? Dare I say I told you so?

The Rules is far from perfect. Like many self-help treatises it confuses what is good when it happens with what can be pressured to happen by human will. The magic of attraction between men and women has to occur, and cannot be forced. But if anything is certain it is that aggressive, mannish women send men running for the exits. Feminism has failed nature's test, and *The Rules* has called its bluff. *The Rules* knows this, and feminists know *The Rules* knows this. That is why the literati are sputtering, and why it is a significant step on the long road back towards sanity. RRR

Triple R (ISSN 1080-4420) is published monthly by the Center for Libertarian Studies, 875 Mahler Rd., Suite 150, Burlingame, CA 94010. (800) 325-7257. Periodicals Postage paid at Burlingame, CA, and additional mailing offices. Postmasters: Send address changes to *Triple R*, P.O. Box 4091, Burlingame, CA 94011. *Editor*: Llewellyn H. Rockwell, Jr. *Contributing Editors*: David Gordon, Paul Gottfried, Hans-Hermann Hoppe, Michael Levin, Justin Raimondo, and Jeffrey Tucker. *Publisher*: Burton S. Blumert. *Managing Editor*: Sybil Regan. Subscription: $49 for 12 issues. Single issue: $5. Copyright © 1997 by the Center for Libertarian Studies. All rights reserved. Unauthorized reproduction of this newsletter or its contents by xerography, facsimile, or any other means is illegal.

WHERE THE RIGHT GOES WRONG

Hans-Hermann Hoppe

The American right is generally divided into three camps: the global hawks, the traditionalists, and the libertarians. Let's set aside the global hawks as hopeless allies of the imperial world state who look fondly upon international war and military government. It's not clear why they should be considered on the right at all. That leaves us the traditionalists or traditional conservatives, and the libertarians, who like free markets but most often want to toss out tradition in favor of a social and cultural free-for-all.

There are strong reasons why modern conservatism and modern libertarianism are not suitable ideological vehicles for the restoration of a civilized social order. In effect, if not by design, the conventional ideological taxonomy of the right leaves nowhere for the clear-headed lover of liberty and property, and hater of the welfare-warfare state, to turn. I'll explain why, and offer an alternative.

The Right and Wrong of Conservatism

What distinguishes conservatives from adherents of other political philosophies? Foremost, that they believe in a natural order. That order can be disturbed–by earthquakes and disease, by war and tyranny–but it can never be abolished. And no matter what the circumstances, the normal can always be distinguished from the abnormal.

In this tradition, conservatives see households based on private property–in cooperation with a community of other households–as the most fundamental, natural, ancient, and indispensable social units. They also see the household as a model of the social order. As a hierarchical order exists in a family, for example, so it exists within a community of families. Above all, conservatives have wanted to conserve the family and the social hierarchies based on kinship relations and layers of authority.

All of this is a good fit with traditional libertarian doctrine, which views natural order as flowing from natural liberty. But conservatism in our time has been deeply corrupted. It never recovered from the transformation of the U.S. and Europe into mass democracies from World War I onward. Instead of challenging democracy at its very root, it came to terms with it and the global wars the state conducted on its behalf. As a result, conservatism fell back on its pure moral doctrine, stripped of institutional context, and was gradually transformed into a movement in favor of one or another variety of democratic statism.

For example, today's conservatives worry, as they should, about divorce, illegitimacy, loss of parental and spiritual authority, multiculturalism, alternative lifestyles, promiscuity, and crime; all are deviations from the natural order. But the spokesmen for the conservative establishment do not recognize that their goal of restoring normalcy requires drastic anti-statist political and social changes.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Social Democracy of the Heart

How, for example, does Pat Buchanan (among many other examples) propose to fix the problem of moral degeneration and cultural rot? Sometimes he will say that those parts of the federal Leviathan responsible for the proliferation of moral and cultural pollution–such as the Department of Education and the National Endowment of the Arts–should be cut down to size. This is to the good, but it hardly goes far enough. Government involvement in education must be fundamentally opposed and abolished. A natural order in education means that it is entirely a family matter.

Worse, there is no recognition that moral degeneracy and cultural rot have deeper causes in the welfare state, and cannot be cured by some national curriculum or presidential declamation. Indeed, the traditionalists explicitly defend the three core institutions of the welfare state: social security, medicare, and unemployment subsidies. And they want to expand the social responsibilities of the state by assigning it the task of "protecting," by means of import and export restrictions, American jobs.

The traditionalists freely admit they are statists. They detest and ridicule capitalism, free markets, free trade, and wealth, advocating a new proletarian conservatism which amalgamates cultural conservatism, nationalism, and socialism, with such policies as federal confiscation of all estates over $1 million.

Writes a leading traditionalist, "while the left could win Middle Americans through its economic measures, it lost them through its social and cultural radicalism, and while the right could attract Middle Americans through appeals to law and order and defense of sexual normality, conventional morals and religion, traditional social institutions and invocations of nationalism and patriotism, it lost Middle Americans when it rehearsed its old bourgeois economic formulas." His answer is combine the economic policies of the left and the nationalism and cultural conservatism of the right to create "a new identity synthesizing both the economic interests and cultural-national loyalties of the proletarianized middle class in a separate and unified political movement."

Historicist contempt and ignorance of economics does not alter the fact that inexorable economic laws do exist.

Is Buchananism Possible?

But is it possible to maintain the current economic socialism and restore cultural normalcy? Traditionalists do not feel the need to ask this question, because they think that politics is largely a matter of will and power. If only a leader wants something, and he can seize the government power to implement his will, everything can be achieved. The man they denounce as a "dead Austrian economist," Ludwig von Mises, characterized this belief as "historicism," the intellectual posture of the German academic socialists who justified any and all statist measures.

But historicist contempt and ignorance of economics does not alter the fact that inexorable economic laws do exist. You cannot have your cake and eat it too. What you consume now cannot be consumed in the future. Producing more of one good requires producing less of another. No wishful thinking or government mandate can make such laws go away.

To believe otherwise will only result in practical failure. As Mises notes, "economic history is a long record of government policies that failed because they were designed with a bold disregard for the laws of economics." In this light, the traditionalist program of social democratic nationalism is just another impossible scheme. For it is impossible to maintain the core institutions of the welfare state and return to traditional families, norms, conduct, and culture. You can have welfare or traditional morals, but not both, for the pillars of the welfare state that the traditionalists want to preserve untouched are themselves the cause of cultural and social decay.

To recognize this, it is only necessary to recall one of the most fundamental laws of economics. That is, compulsory wealth redistribution involves taking from some–the haves–and giving to others–the have-nots. Accordingly, the incentive to be an owner is reduced, and the incentive to be a non-owner is increased. In fact, as another "dead Austrian economist," Henry Hazlitt, pointed out, the welfare state subsidizes, and thus worsens, the very problems it claims to solve.

By subsidizing people with tax funds because they are poor, there will be more poverty. By subsidizing people because they are unemployed, there will be more unemployment. By subsidizing unwed mothers, there will be more unwed mothers and more illegitimate births, and so on.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Onslaught on the Family

This is most obvious in the system of so-called social security that has plagued Western Europe since the 1880s and the U.S. since the 1930s: of compulsory government "insurance" against old age, illness, occupational injury, unemployment, indigence, etc. In conjunction with the even older compulsory system of public education, social security amounts to a giant onslaught on the family and personal responsibility.

Relieving individuals of the obligation to provide for their own income, health, safety, old age, and children's education also reduces the range and temporal horizon of private provision. In addition, it lowers the value of marriage, family, children, and kinship relations. It promotes irresponsibility, shortsightedness, negligence, illness, and even destructionism while punishing responsibility, farsightedness, diligence, health, and conservatism.

The compulsory old-age insurance system in particular, by which the old are subsidized through taxes imposed on the young, has systematically weakened the natural inter-generational bonds among parents, grandparents, and children. The old no longer need rely on their children if they have made no provision for their own old age; and the young, with typically less wealth, must support the old, with typically more wealth, rather than the other way around, as is normal within families.

Consequently, not only do people want to have fewer children–and indeed, birthrates have fallen in half since the onset of social security–but also the respect which the young traditionally accorded to their elders is diminished. Indicators of family disintegration and malfunction–such as divorce, illegitimacy, child abuse, parent abuse, wife abuse, single parenting, singledom, alternative lifestyles, and abortion–have all increased.

Subsidizing Sickness

Moreover, socialization of the health care system through medicaid and medicare and the regulation of the health-insurance industry (in particular by abolishing an insurer's right of refusal) has created a monstrous machinery of redistribution at the expense of responsible individuals and low-risk groups in favor of the irresponsible and high-risk groups. Subsidies for the ill, unhealthy, and disabled breed illness, disease, and disability, and weaken the desire to work for a living and to live a healthy life.

As Mises put it, "being ill is not a phenomenon independent of conscious will." The "destructionist aspect" of government "accident and health insurance lies above all in the fact that such institutions promote accident and illness, hinder recovery, and very often create, or at any rate intensify and lengthen, the functional disorders which follow illness or accident.... To feel healthy is quite different from being healthy in the medical sense.... By weakening or completely destroying the will to be well and able to work, social insurance creates illness and inability to work; it produces the habit of complaining–which is in itself a neurosis–and neuroses of other kinds.... As a social institution it makes a people sick bodily and mentally or at least helps to multiply, lengthen, and intensify disease."

Spare me the task of explaining in detail the ancient fallacies of the traditionalists' protectionism. If they were right, their argument in favor of economic protection would amount to an indictment of all trade, and a defense of the thesis that each family would be better off if it never traded with anyone else. Certainly in this case no one could ever lose his job, and unemployment due to "unfair" competition would be reduced to zero. Yet such a full-employment society would not be prosperous; it would be condemned to poverty and starvation.

International protectionism, while less destructive than a policy of interpersonal protectionism, would result in precisely the same effect. So this is not authentic conservatism; conservatism wants families to be prosperous and strong. Protectionism is economic destructionism.

Most of the moral degeneration and cultural rot around us is the inescapable result of the welfare state. Classical conservatives knew this, and they vigorously opposed public education and social security. They knew that the central state always seeks to break down and ultimately destroy families and the hierarchies of authority that are the natural outgrowth of family-based communities in order to strengthen its own power. Classical conservatives knew that to do so, central states would harness the natural rebellion of adolescents against paternal authority. And they knew that socialized education and socialized responsibility were the means of bringing this about.

The moral degeneration and cultural rot around us is the inescapable result of the welfare state.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Social education and social security provide a way for rebellious youth to escape paternal authority, and to get away with continuous misbehavior. Old conservatives knew that these government policies would emancipate the individual from the discipline imposed by family and community life only to subject him to the direct control of the state. And they knew that this would inevitably lead to systematic societal regression, emotionally and mentally, from adulthood to adolescence.

In contrast, proletarian conservatism is ignorant of all this. For if one is indeed concerned about America's moral decay and wants to restore normalcy to society and culture, one must oppose the welfare state, root, stem, and branch.

A Return to Normalcy

A return to normalcy requires the elimination of the present social security system: of unemployment insurance, social security, medicare, medicaid, public education, etc. If we are ever to restore normalcy, government funds and power must dwindle to, or even fall below, their 19th-century levels. Hence, true conservatives must be libertarians, that is, anti-statists. They cannot follow proletarian conservatism or neoconservatism; they cannot seek a return to traditional morality while at the same time endorsing the very institutions responsible for the perversion and destruction of traditional morals.

Most contemporary conservatives, of course, especially the media darlings, are not conservatives at all but social democrats—either internationalist or nationalist. True conservatives, on the other hand, can only be radical libertarians, and as such, demand the demolition—as a moral and economic perversion—of the entire structure of social security.

The Right and Wrong of Libertarianism

Libertarianism's single principle is original appropriation: that is, ownership of scarce resources is acquired through an act of original appropriation, by which resources are taken out of a state of nature and put into a state of civilization. From the principle of original appropriation, rules concerning the transformation and exchange of originally appropriated resources are derived, and all of law, including the principles of punishment, is then reconstructed in terms of a theory of property rights.

If one wants to restore normalcy to society and culture, one must oppose the welfare state, root, stem, and branch.

I do not want to further analyze or even defend the libertarian theory of justice at this point, although I believe it to be true, indeed to be irrefutably so. Rather, I want to examine the relationship between libertarianism and conservatism. Some commentators, such as Russell Kirk, have characterized libertarianism and conservatism as hostile ideologies. But this is wrong. The relationship between libertarianism and conservatism is one of logical complementarity, sociological reciprocity, and mutual presupposition.

Let me first point out that most leading libertarian thinkers were ardent defenders of traditional morals and manners. Most notably, Murray N. Rothbard, the single most important and influential libertarian thinker, was an outspoken cultural conservative. So was Rothbard's most important teacher, Ludwig von Mises. While this does not prove much, it is indicative of a substantive affinity between the doctrines.

In addition, the conservative and the libertarian view of society are perfectly compatible. To be sure, their method is different. One is empiristic, sociological, and descriptive, and the other rationalistic, philosophical, and logical-constructivist. But as far as the objects on which conservatives and libertarians focus—families, kinship relations, communities, authority, and social hierarchy on the one hand, and property, and its appropriation, transformation, and transfer on the other—it should be clear that while they do not refer to exactly the same thing, they do speak about different aspects of the same goal: social cooperation.

That is, families, authority, communities, and social ranks are the empirical-sociological concretization of the abstract concepts of property, production, exchange, and contract. Property and property relations do not exist apart from families and kinship relations. The latter shape and determine the specific form of property and property relations, but they are at the same time constrained by the universal and eternal laws of scarcity and property.

Families considered normal by conservative standards are *household* families, and the family disintegration and moral and cultural decay which contemporary conservatives deplore is the result of the destruction of households as the economic basis of families by the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

welfare state. Thus, the libertarian theory of justice can actually provide conservatism with a more precise definition and a more rigorous moral defense of its own end than conservatism itself could ever offer.

Counter-Cultural Capitalism

While many of the intellectual creators of modern libertarianism were cultural conservatives, and while libertarian doctrine is fully compatible with the conservative world view, the libertarian movement is adamantly not. To a large extent, this movement has tried to combine radical anti-statism and market economics with cultural leftism and personal hedonism; that is, it is the exact opposite of the traditionalist program of culturally conservative socialism. But like this sort of conservatism, leftist libertarianism is also false and counterproductive.

That much of modern libertarianism is culturally leftist is the result of a superficial understanding of libertarian doctrine by many of its followers, which can be explained by the welfare state's promotion of intellectual and emotional infantilization.

The beginnings of the modern libertarian movement in the U.S. go back to the late 1960s. Simultaneously, promoted by civil rights and the war on poverty, a new mass-phenomenon emerged. A new *Lumpenproletariat* of intellectuals and intellectualized youths, the product of an ever-expanding system of socialist education, arose, alienated from mainstream morals and culture.

Multiculturalism, cultural relativism, and egalitarian anti-authoritarianism were elevated from a transitory phase in mental development (adolescence) to a permanent attitude among grown-up intellectuals and their students.

The principled opposition of the libertarians to the war on Vietnam coincided with the somewhat diffuse opposition by the New Left. In addition, the anarchistic upshot of libertarian doctrine appealed to the counter-cultural left. Was not everyone at liberty to choose his own lifestyle? And did this not imply that vulgarity, obscenity, profanity, drug use, promiscuity, homosexuality, pornography, prostitution, or any other conceivable perversity, insofar as it was a victimless crime, was no crime at all but perfectly legitimate and natural?

The libertarian movement attracted an unusually high number of misfits and plain losers.

The libertarian movement attracted an unusually high number of abnormal types. The counter-cultural ambiance and relativistic "tolerance" of the movement in turn captivated an even greater number of misfits and plain losers. Rothbard, in disgust, referred to them as the "modal" (typical) libertarians. They dreamed of a society where everyone would be free to choose whatever non-aggressive lifestyle, career, or character he wanted, and where, as a result of free-market economics, everyone could do so on a level of general prosperity. Ironically, the movement that had set out to dismantle the state and restore private property and market economics was largely shaped by the mental and emotional products of the welfare state: the new class of permanent adolescents.

The Necessity of Discrimination

This intellectual combination could hardly end happily, and it didn't. Private-property capitalism and egalitarian-multiculturalism are as unlikely a combination as socialism and cultural conservatism. In trying to combine what cannot be combined, much of the modern libertarian movement has contributed to the further erosion of private-property rights (just as much of contemporary conservatism contributed to the erosion of families and traditional morals).

What the counter-cultural libertarians failed to recognize, and what true libertarians cannot emphasize enough, is that the restoration of private-property rights and laissez-faire economics implies a sharp and drastic increase in social discrimination. This would swiftly eliminate most if not all of the life-style experiments so close to the heart of left libertarians. In other words, libertarians must be radical and uncompromising conservatives.

Contrary to the left-libertarians assembled around Beltway institutions, proudly supported by pornographers, child molesters, and drug users, and who urge the central government to enforce various non-discrimination policies and call for a non-discriminatory free immigration policy, true libertarians must embrace discrimination, be it domestic or foreign. Indeed, private property *means* discrimination.

You, not I, own something. You are entitled to exclude me from your property. You may attach conditions to my using your property, and may expel me from it. Moreover, you and I, as private property owners, may enter into a restrictive covenant. We and others may impose limitations on the future use that each of us

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(and our heirs) can make with our property.

The modern welfare state has largely stripped private-property owners of the right to exclude. Employers cannot hire whom they want. Landlords cannot rent to whom they want. Sellers cannot sell to whom they want. Buyers cannot buy from whom they want. And groups of private-property owners may not enter into whatever restrictive covenants they believe to be mutually beneficial. The central state has thus robbed us of much of our personal and physical protection. Not to be able to exclude others means not to be able to protect oneself. The result of this erosion of private property rights under the democratic welfare state is forced integration.

Americans must accept immigrants they do not want, teachers cannot get rid of lousy or ill-behaved students, employers are stuck with poor or destructive employees, landlords are forced to live with bad renters, banks and insurance companies are not allowed to avoid bad risks, restaurants and bars must accommodate unwelcome customers, and private clubs and covenantal associations are compelled to accept members and actions in violation of their own rules and restrictions. Moreover, on public property in particular, forced integration has taken on the form of permanent danger: of normlessless and lawlessness.

To exclude other people from his property is *the* means by which the owner can avoid events that will lower the value of his property. If the owner is not permitted to freely exclude the ill-behaved, lazy, unreliable, and rotten students, employees, and customers, there will be an increase in them, and that property values will fall. In fact, forced integration of all sorts breeds ill behavior and bad character. In civilized society, the ultimate price for ill behavior is expulsion, and all-around rotten characters (even if they commit no criminal offense) will find themselves quickly expelled from everywhere and by everyone. They will become outcasts, physically removed from civilization.

This is a stiff price to pay; hence, the frequency of such behavior is reduced. By contrast, if you are prevented from expelling others from your property whenever you deem their presence undesirable, rotten characteristics are rendered less costly and therefore encouraged. Rather than being isolated and ultimately removed from society, the bums–in any conceivable department of bumhood–are permitted to perpetrate their unpleasantries everywhere, and so bums and bum-like behavior proliferate. The results of forced integration are only too visible. All social relations–whether in private or business life–have become increasingly egalitarian and uncivilized.

The results of forced integration are only too visible. All social relations have become increasingly egalitarian and uncivilized.

In distinct contrast, a society where the right to exclude was fully restored to owners of private property would be profoundly unegalitarian and discriminatory. There would be little or none of that "tolerance" and "open-mindedness" so dear to left-libertarians; all economic exchange and social relations would be governed by strict adherence to the principles of ownership, contract, cooperation, and exclusion.

We would be well on the way to restoring the freedom of association as it is implied in the institution of private property if towns could do what they did as a matter of course until well into the 19th century in Europe and the U.S. There would be signs regarding entrance requirements to the town, and, once in town, requirements for entering specific pieces of property (no beggars, bums or homeless, for example); and those who did not meet these entrance requirements would be kicked out as trespassers. Almost instantly, cultural and moral normalcy would reassert itself.

Counter-cultural lifestyle experimentalists would once again have to pay a price for their behavior. If they continued in it, they would be largely barred from civilized society and have to live physically separate from it, in ghettos or on the fringes of society, and many positions or professions would be closed to them. On the other hand, if they wanted to live and advance within society, they would have to adjust to the moral and cultural norms of the society they wanted to enter.

To thus assimilate would not necessarily imply that one would have to give up one's abnormal lifestyle. It would imply, however, that one could no longer exhibit one's alternative behavior in a way people disapprove of. It would have to be hidden from the public eye and restricted to the privacy of one's own four walls. Displaying it would lead to exclusion from society.

Every social order requires a self-enforcement mechanism. More

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

precisely, social orders are not maintained automatically; they require conscious effort and purposeful action on the part of the members of society. In a libertarian society, there would be sharp increase in discrimination against behaviors contrary to high cultural standards and the social norm generally.

The Centrality of the Covenant

The libertarian model of society is one of private-property owners who, instead of living isolated from one another, associate with others as neighbors. In the language of property-rights theory, by virtue of choosing neighborhood over isolation, independent property owners enter into a mutually binding, restrictive, and protective covenant.

Through this covenant, they agree to certain limitations on the use of their property and personal conduct (initially set and defined by the founder of the community in question); and every freeholder consents to these restrictions based on his belief that doing so will be to his own as well as everyone else's personal advantage, and increase his and everyone else's property values.

Get These Tapes!

Listen in on a very private *Triple R* conference on the U.S. political scam, with Joe Sobran, Ron Paul, Michael Levin, Erik von Kuehnelt-Leddihn, Hans Hoppe, Jeffrey Tucker, Lew Rockwell, and five other giants. Includes our hottest discussion *ever* on Germanophobia. The handsomely boxed set of tapes is $99 postpaid, plus your promise not to share them with the media. Phone toll-free 800-325-7257.

The perfectly harmonious conservative model of a society adds to this the fundamental insight that, as a matter of natural-empirical fact, households typically are made up of families, and communities are normally tied together by kin and kinship relations. Indeed, the constant tendency will be for them to consist of genetically related and linguistically and culturally homogeneous people.

Egalitarianism, in every form and shape, is incompatible with the idea of private property.

For the libertarian, the enforcement of the covenant is then a matter of self-interest, and its success depends crucially on the actions of the natural elite and their authority. For the conservative, enforcement is a matter of family and kinship interest, and its success depends on the actions of the heads of households, families, and clans.

In any case, to maintain society–to protect and enhance the value of private property and of families and kin–the members of society, and especially the natural elite and the heads of families, must be willing to take two forms of protective measures. First, they must be willing to defend themselves by physical force and punishment against external invaders and domestic criminals. Second and equally important, they must be willing to defend themselves by ostracism and expulsion against anyone who advocates actions incompatible with the very purpose of the covenant: to protect property, family, and kin.

In this regard, a society always faces the double and interconnected threat of egalitarianism and cultural relativism. Egalitarianism, in every form and shape, is incompatible with the idea of private property. Private property implies exclusivity, inequality, and difference. And cultural relativism is incompatible with the foundational fact of families and inter-generational kinship relations.

Families and kinship relations imply cultural absolutism. As a matter of socio-psychologic fact, both egalitarian and relativistic sentiments find support among ever-new generations of adolescents. Owing to their still incomplete mental development, male juveniles especially are always susceptible to both ideas. Adolescence is marked by regular–and for this stage normal–outbreaks of rebellion by the young against the discipline imposed on them by family life and paternal authority.

Cultural relativism and multiculturalism provide the ideological means of emancipating oneself from these constraints. And egalitarianism–based on the infantile view that property is "given" (and thus distributed arbitrarily) rather than individually appropriated and produced (and hence, distributed justly)–provides the intellectual tool through which rebellious youths can lay claim to the economic means for their life outside the disciplinary framework of families and communities.

The enforcement of a covenant is largely a matter of prudence, of course. How and when to react, and what protective measures to take, requires judgment on the part of the members of society and especially the natural social elites. Thus, so long as the threat of moral relativism and egalitarianism is restricted to a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

small proportion of juveniles for only a brief period in life (until they settle into family-constrained adulthood), it may be sufficient to do hardly anything. A small dose of ridicule may be all that is needed.

The situation is very different, however, if the spirit of moral relativism and egalitarianism has taken hold among adult members of society. If they habitually advocate egalitarian sentiments, whether in the form of democracy (majority rule) or of communism, it becomes essential that other members, and in particular the natural social elites, be prepared to exclude and ultimately expel them.

In a covenant settled on by property owners for the purpose of protecting their private property, no such thing as a right to unlimited speech exists, not even to unlimited speech on one's own property. One may say innumerable things and promote almost any idea under the sun, but naturally people might not be permitted to advocate ideas contrary to the very purpose of the covenant, of preserving and protecting private property, such as democracy or communism. Likewise, in a covenant founded for the purpose of protecting family and kin, there can be no tolerance toward those who practice and promote lifestyles contrary to social norms, such as hedonism and parasitism.

Libertarians should be moral and cultural conservatives of the most uncompromising kind.

The Virtue of Intolerance

Libertarians should be moral and cultural conservatives of the most uncompromising kind. The current state of affairs of moral degeneration, social disintegration, and cultural rot is precisely the result of too much tolerance, made possible only by the expansion of the redistributive state and the proliferation of the common ownership of property. Rather than having all habitual democrats, communists, and alternative lifestylists excluded from civilization, they were tolerated in the midst of society.

Of course, this toleration encouraged even more egalitarian and relativistic sentiments, until at last the point was reached where the authority of excluding anyone from anything had effectively evaporated, while the power of the central state, as manifested in forced integration, had correspondingly grown.

Libertarians, in their attempt to establish a free and natural social order, must strive to regain from the state the right to exclusion inherent in private property. Yet even before they may accomplish this, to render such an achievement even possible, libertarians must begin to reassert, as far as they can, the right to free association, which necessarily means the right to exclusion, in everyday life.

Libertarians, then, have a moral duty to advocate and practice intolerance and discrimination: against egalitarians, democrats, socialists, communists, multi-culturalists, and environmentalists; against ill manners, misconduct, incompetence, rudeness, vulgarity, and obscenity.

As true conservatives will have to dissociate themselves from right-wing social democratic traditionalists, true libertarians must dissociate themselves from left-lifestyle-libertarians. Those who care about the future of families and prosperity, of morals and property, have no other alternative but to become uncompromising advocates of strict adherence to private property, and all that it implies, as the very basis of civilization. RRR

HOPPE AND THE *FREEMAN*

Paul Gottfried

Recently bad feelings were aroused when social economist Hans-Herman Hoppe, in a book review, questioned whether Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany were "on a par" politically in the 1930s. On the basis of economic control, degrees of surveillance, and the difficulty one would have had leaving or entering these countries, Hoppe considers Soviet Russia in the thirties to have been more totalitarian than Nazi Germany.

Note that Hoppe does not draw this comparison as a Nazi apologist, a charge that was made against him by several "libertarian" New York critics, after his review came out in the *Freeman*. Nor does Hoppe underestimate Hitler's destructive capacities that were fully unleashed during the Second World War, especially against the Jews.

Hoppe only says that the book he is reviewing is wrong. A disinterested spectator looking at the Soviet

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and Nazi experiments in the thirties would have found the Soviets to be more murderous and socially intrusive. He cites the case of Bishop Bernhard von Galen and other Catholic prelates who protested the Nazi program of euthanasia. Unlike the response of the Soviet regime, which would have been to kill the churchmen, something Stalin had already done to Orthodox and Catholic clergy by the hundreds of thousands, the Nazis halted the offending program.

But many intellectuals today continue to whitewash Soviet agents and perpetrators of Communist atrocities. Then and now, many in America and elsewhere have tried to defend the Soviets as an alternative to fascism, although neither fascist Italy nor Nazi Germany until the forties came close to replicating the brutal horrors of Communist rule.

Hoppe was guilty, however, of violating another less offensive leftist historical myth, one that requires that Stalinists and Nazis be treated as equally totalitarian. Supposedly both represent two sides of the same coin–or two different fascist faces, one the unadorned article and the other what Harry Truman called "Red Fascism," i.e., fascists who pretend to be progressives but behave like menacing rightists. Alas this unhappy metaphor sacrifices veracity for the sake of sensitivity.

Neither fascist Italy nor Nazi Germany until the forties came close to replicating the brutal horrors of Communist rule.

In order to make anti-Communism respectable to those who fear the nationalist right and dread whatever is associated with Nazism, liberal anti-Communists (and for years yours truly) presented the Communists as imitation Nazis. Like Nazis, Communists, we said and were told, practiced terror, persecuted demonized minorities, and fought wars of expansion.

Works by Carl Friedrich, Zbigniew Brezinski, and Hannah Arendt were cited repeatedly in support of the argument that right- and left-wing totalitarians were more alike than different. After all, didn't both engage in mass-killing, manipulate communications and education, and make truth relative to what those in power wanted their subjects to believe?

One problem with most of these presentations, and with George Orwell's anti-Communist (but really anti-fascist) novel *Nineteen Eighty-Four,* is the reduction of the Communist totalitarian model to its Nazi counterpart. Most analysts of totalitarianism impose the Nazi model upon the Soviet experience. This is equally true for the interpretations of Soviet tyranny offered by some of the conservative emigres whom I grew up reading. Both Eric Voegelin and Leo Strauss seem to have had in mind the Nazi regime

Dear *Triple R:*
Start sending me (or renew) your newsletter:
❑ $49 for 1-year; ❑ $98 for 2-years; ❑ $147 for 3-years.
❑ Enclosed is my tax-deductible contribution (made out to CLS).
❑ Send information to the friends I've listed on a separate sheet.

Credit card number: _____

Signature:_____ Exp. Date_____

Or phone 1-800-325-7257 for VISA, Amex, or MasterCard charges.

Name_____

Street _____

City_____ State_____ Zip_____

Triple R, Center for Libertarian Studies, P.O. Box 4091, Burlingame, CA 94011

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that they encountered as young men when they described the Soviets. Significantly, both were far more terrified by the anti-democratic neopagan Nietzsche than by the fathers of European revolutionary socialism.

The most dangerous sources of totalitarianism are on the left, as Hoppe suggests in his critical observation and as George Watson and Ralph Raico, among other historians, make clear. With Communist regimes, totalitarianism has been the rule, and some have killed even more victims than Nazi Germany. At its worst Hitler's government was following the pattern of mass extermination initiated by the Soviets.

By the late thirties, taking into account the forced starvations of Soviet farm collectivization and the mass killings of political and "class" opponents, the Soviet Union had killed many millions more than all the fascisms in existence. Moreover, mass killing and the suppression of all dissent was not characteristic of all fascism, as witness Mussolini's regime in the twenties and clerical fascists in Austria in the early thirties. Clerical fascists were, for the most part, only mildly authoritarian, made minimal efforts to control the economy, allowed people who were not active enemies of the regime to cross borders, and had more of a dissenting academy than exists in today's America.

By contrast, Communist regimes have been totalitarian, unless in a state of utter collapse. Stalinism, Maoism, Pol-Potism, and Castroism have involved paradigmatically totalitarian forms of government. Erasing any line of separation between state and society, nationalizing the economy, and incarcerating and murdering large percentages of the indigenous populations, the Communists have behaved inhumanely because of their obsessive goal of transforming the human race.

Truth was not served by treating this phenomenon as "Red fascism." Nazis but not all fascists took over Red totalitarianism, after the evils of the revolutionary left had been unleashed upon Russians and other hapless Eastern Europeans. And while Nazism was not simply a variant on Stalinism and had its own obsessions and gangsterism, much of what made it demonic was what it borrowed from the older and better-established totalitarianism.

Hoppe "was repeating something that even the Frankfort School knew, that while both Stalin and Hitler killed, the Soviets were the first to create a totalitarian state."

Hoppe's making of this argument may be an exercise in futility but one that should be made nonetheless. For unless our generation can be made to grasp what defines the socialist left, the passion for unbounded power to change human nature, we shall likely have to endure more of the same.

Socialism, after all, did not disappear with the fall of the Berlin Wall; nor is the major danger to once free societies now being posed by neo-fascists. No less now than seventy years ago, socialism remains by far the most formidable threat to bourgeois classically liberal society, or what remains of it.

While fascism was merely a generational phenomenon that took both relatively benign and extremely malign forms, administrative collectivism allied to egalitarian doctrines has a far larger historical significance. It is the poison on which we continue to choke.

* * * * *

A concluding observation may be in order. Having read Hoppe's offending statements to several scholars without any link to the "conservative movement," none found anything particularly controversial about their content. My associate at *Telos* magazine, Paul Piccone, observed that I–or Hoppe–"was repeating something that even the Frankfort School knew, that while both Stalin and Hitler killed, the Soviets were the first to create a totalitarian state."

In conversation with Eugene Genovese, David Gordon obtained more or less the same response when he discussed Hoppe's *faux pas*. Like Piccone, Genovese thought that what he was hearing was a historical commonplace. Whether it should be a commonplace, it is not, at least not among movement conservatives (and libertarians), who remain terrified of the charge of insensitivity. The publisher of the *Freeman*, for example, banned Hoppe forever more, and even fired the book-review editor and the guest editor of that issue.

Thus we have more "concerned" robots, who cannot mention the horrors of Communism without bringing up the H-word. While he was admittedly quite horrible, the revolutionary left would have turned the 20th century into a nightmare even without that grotesque little man with the funny mustache. RRR

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED